DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 787 EC 151 641

AUTHOR	Williams, Peyton, Jr.
TITLE	Admission Policies and Practices of State Operated Residential Schools for the Deaf in the United States.
INSTITUTION	Georgia State Dept. of Education, Atlanta.
PUB DATE	Aug 82
NOTE	66p.; Charts have small print and may not reproduce well.
AVAILABLE FROM	Georgia School for the Deaf, P.O. Box 98, Cave Spring, GA 30124 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Admission Criteria; Compliance (Legal); *Deafness; *Federal Legislation; Individualized Education Programs; Referral; *Residential Schools; School Surveys; *State Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Education for All Handicapped Children Act

ABSTRACT

Admission policies and practices for state-operated residential schools for the deaf were studied following the full implementation of Public Law 94-142. Questionnaires were returned by 56 school administrators representing 93 percent of the total number of residential schools for the deaf in the United States. Results include the following: 1) student referrals are based primarily on the degree of hearing loss; 2) 46% of the schools develop an individualized education plan (IEP) prior to placement; 3) local school districts are the major referral source, and 53% of the schools do not accept other sources of referrals; 4) there are no appreciable differences in admission policies/procedures in different regions and in schools with different types of governance; 5) parents are included, as required by P.L. 94-142, in placement and IEP development; and 6) the schools retain a high degree of autonomy in decisions to admit or deny admission to a prospective student. Recommendations include: the schools should clearly identify the type of disabilities, in addition to deafness, that can be served; the legality of the denial of admission should be reviewed; and the school should have the responsibility of evaluating prospective students and developing the IEP. Additional materials included in the document are: specifications for a model admission policy, recommendations for future research, a glossary, a questionnaire, and approximately 75 references. (SEW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED228787

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Admission Policies and Practices of State Operated Residential Schools for the Deaf

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Taylor Wilson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC151641

Reprints of this publication may be ordered from the Georgia School for the Deaf, Cave Spring, Georgia 30124, for a nominal fee designated for the school's Student Activity Fund.

ADMISSION POLICIES AND PRACTICES

OF STATE OPERATED RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS

FOR THE DEAF IN THE UNITED STATES

by

Peyton Williams, Jr., Ph.D.
Associate State Superintendent of Schools
Georgia Department of Education
Atlanta, Georgia

August 1982

FOREWORD

A thorough review of the literature in special education following the full implementation of Public Law 94-142, revealed a void of studies dealing with the admission policies and practices of state operated residential schools for the deaf in the United States. The only study specifically addressing admission policies of residential schools for the deaf was conducted in 1966 by Anderson, Stevens and Stuckless. However, this study addressed admission policies and practices used by residential schools in admitting deaf students who were mentally retarded.

This publication presents a "state-of-the-art" review of admission policies and practices of residential schools for the deaf in the United States. Hopefully, it will be of some value to residential school administrators in the development and refinement of admission policies and in assessing their school's current admission policies and practices.

Sincere appreciation is extended to Jimmy Whitworth, Superintendent of the Georgia School for the Deaf, and Miss Mona McCubbin, Superintendent of the Atlanta Area School for the Deaf, for their invaluable assistance and advice in the preparation of this publication. Special thanks are extended to Dr. Jane Lee for editing the final draft.

The superintendents of residential schools across the United States who completed and returned the survey questionnaire are gratefully acknowledged. Many of these distinguished educators shared valuable suggestions and comments with the author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD ii

INTRODUCTION 1

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY 4

METHODOLOGY 5

- INSTRUMENT FOR COLLECTING THE DATA 5
- PROCEDURES FOR OBTAINING DATA 7
- DATA ANALYSIS 7

RESULTS 8

- GOVERNANCE 8
- ADMISSION POLICY 12
- ADMISSION PROCEDURE 15
- DENIED ADMISSION PROCEDURES 18
- INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PLANS 22
- PLACEMENT 23

REVIEW OF ADMISSION POLICY DOCUMENTS 25

CONCLUSIONS 29

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FIELD OF THE EDUCATION OF THE DEAF 31

- IDENTIFICATION OF DISABILITIES SERVED 31
- DENIED ADMISSIONS 33
- IEP AND PLACEMENT 33
- COMPONENTS OF A MODEL ADMISSION POLICY 35

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH 40

REFERENCES 43

GLOSSARY OF SELECTED TERMS 48

APPENDIX A

- SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE 50

"All who apply for admittance into the institution as beneficiaries shall produce a certificate signed by two or more justices of the Inferior Court certifying that he is over 10 years and under 30 years of age, in indigent circumstances, and unable to educate themselves."

Board of Trustees, Georgia School for the Deaf
September 1851

Introduction

Public education in America has responded in an unprecedented manner to the needs of unserved and inadequately served handicapped children through the provision of special instructional programs and services in local school districts within recent years. This response with new and improved services to the handicapped was evidenced with the implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Public Law 94-142.

Under Public Law 94-142, the responsibility for the education of school-age handicapped children rests with the local school district in which the student is a legal resident. This federal funding Act mandates that to the maximum extent possible, handicapped children are to be served in an environment with non-handicapped children.

State operated residential schools for the deaf were established for the purpose of providing the same educational opportunities to deaf students that were provided to non-handicapped students enrolled in regular school programs. It is clear that the implementation of Public Law 94-142 has had an impact on residential schools serving special populations, such as the deaf.

This study was designed to determine how students are admitted to state operated residential schools for the deaf following the full implementation of Public Law 94-142, which altered the historical role of such schools.

The provision of education for the deaf in America in the early 1800's was an experimental program. Many of the experimental programs in education in America from 1787 to 1900 were first conducted in private schools and/or agencies (Cordasco, 1965). The early state residential schools for the deaf were initially established as private eleemosynary schools or institutions in many states. The majority of these schools during their early history were divorced from the organizational structures governing elementary and secondary education in their respective state.

According to Brill (1974), although many schools were established as private schools, their major financial support came from their respective states. These schools operated under a variety of governing structures and governing authorities. To some extent, this arrangement has not changed significantly.

Griffing (1977) has pointed out that public residential schools for the deaf were organized to serve a special and particular societal need -- the education of deaf children. These schools by design were selective in admitting students to their programs.

It has only been within the past ten years that residential schools for the deaf have felt the impact of the state and national policy issues

affecting education in general. Basically, these schools have existed as "closed social systems" primarily concerned with internal self-maintenance.

Since the full implementation of Public Law 94-142, there has been a concerted effort in many states to coordinate the service delivery system for handicapped children. This establishment of a relationship of responsibility for the handicapped mandated by Public Law 94-142 between the resources and agencies in a given state has been evidenced through cooperative agreements between state and local agencies and in some states, the reorganization of existing services.

The United States Bureau of Education of the Handicapped (1979) reported in a study of state operated schools and institutions for the handicapped receiving federal financial assistance that the administrative structures of state education agencies has changed so as to place more importance on the total special education program. This study also revealed that the less severely handicapped are being served in local school districts.

Where the education of deaf children should take place has received considerable attention since 1975. Much of this concern centers around the concept of "appropriate placement" and the "least restrictive environment". Residential schools have been considered by some special educators as being "restrictive" in that these schools serve a specific population and the opportunities for interaction with hearing students and others is or has been, at best, minimal.

Purpose of the Study

The chief task of this study was to describe the process by which students are admitted to residential schools. The study was designed to survey and recount the influence of admission policies on placement, referral sources, admission differences among residential schools, parental involvement in placement decisions, and the rights of residential schools to admit or deny admission to a deaf student.

The need for this study centered around the absence of research or literature on the topic. Where information does exist, there are gaps and weaknesses.

This investigation focused on the following questions which were also used to give direction to the construction of the questionnaire that was used in the survey of state operated residential schools for the deaf.

1. Are student referrals to state operated residential schools for the deaf based on the individualized education plan?

2. What is the major source of referrals of students admitted and placed in state operated residential schools for the deaf?

3. Do state operated residential schools for the deaf differ in their admission policies and practices by regions of the United States?

4. Do state operated residential schools for the deaf under different governance structures differ in their admission policies and practices?

5. What role do local school districts play in the referral and admission of students to state operated residential schools for the deaf?

6. How are parents of students involved in the placement decisions of students admitted to state operated residential schools for the deaf?

7. Do state operated residential schools for the deaf retain the option to admit or deny admission to students?

The literature is void of studies or reports on admission policies and practices in state operated residential schools for the deaf since the advent of Public Law 94-142.

The questions giving direction to this study were designed to yield data to define and describe the admission policies and practices of residential schools for the deaf and to form a basis for developing policies that would best serve deaf children.

The study was intended to review the relationship between the admission policies of residential schools for the deaf and the authority or policy of the local education agency on deciding the placement of deaf children. It was beyond the scope of this study to discuss or evaluate the curriculum, methods of instruction, or other aspects of educational programming and services provided in either public schools offering programs for the deaf or the residential schools included in this investigation.

Methodology

Instrument for Collecting the Data

A questionnaire consisting of 34 items was developed to obtain data for this investigation. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix A. The questionnaire was designed to yield information related to governance, admission policy, admission procedure, denied admission procedures, individualized education programs, and placement in state operated residential schools for the deaf.

In the development of the questionnaire, a review of relevant literature relating to specific mandates of Public Law 94-142 addressing the individualized education plan, the least restrictive environment, and parental involvement was made. The literature was also reviewed on residential schools for the deaf, areas relating to the education of the deaf, and policy development. This review provided the basis for formulating the questionnaire items.

The questionnaire was constructed to measure the specific variables inherent in each question. The process of acquiring content validity has been discussed by Bloom, Hastings, and Madaus (1971). Thorndike (1971) has suggested that content validity can be determined by acquiring a panel of experts to judge whether the author has selected a set of questions representative of the area of concern. Cronbach (1970) suggested that content validity is a matter of judging each question, the description of questions, and the representative value of what the author intended to measure.

The initial draft questionnaire was evaluated by the Office of Demographic Studies at Gallaudet College. This office evaluated the instrument in relation to its construction and relevancy to the study.

Following this evaluation and revision of the questionnaire, it was submitted to six superintendents of residential schools for the deaf in four regions of the United States for completion and evaluation.

Two external professional reviewers also evaluated the revised

questionnaire. These reviewers included one state official in charge of state residential schools for the deaf and one retired superintendent who has authored books and other publications dealing with the education of the deaf.

The recommendation of each member of the panel of expert reviewers was incorporated in the final draft of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into six sections: (1) Governance; (2) Admission Policy; (3) Admission Procedures; (4) Denied Admission Procedures; (5) Individualized Education Plan; and (6) Placement.

Procedures for Obtaining the Data

Questionnaires were mailed to 60 superintendents of state operated residential schools for the deaf in the United States.

The schools include in their enrollment a total of 16,053 students, or 90 percent of the total number of students enrolled in residential schools for the deaf in the United States. Student populations of individual schools range from 82 to 710.

Fifty-six residential school administrators representing 56 states and the District of Columbia responded to the questionnaire. The response rate represented 93 percent of the residential school superintendents receiving the instrument.

Data Analysis

The responses to each question included in the questionnaire

requiring a specific answer was entered on a data card for computer processing using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Program (SPSS).

All sections of the questionnaire were summarized and reported with frequencies and percentages on a national basis using a table format for each item. The information contained in each table varied depending on the scope and nature of the data.

The residential schools participating in the study were classified by governance type. The schools were also classified according to the four regions of the United States used by the United States Bureau of Census (1980): Northeast, North Central, South and West.

The open-ended questions included in the questionnaire were designed to obtain unbiased information. This information was analyzed by frequency of responses to indicate trends. High frequencies of similar responses are reported for each question by category. All superintendents did not respond to all items listed in the questionnaire.

Results

Governance

Fifty-six state operated residential schools responded to the questionnaire used in this study. This represented 93 percent of the total number of residential schools in the United States serving deaf students.

The majority of the schools included in the study are operated by state boards of education and governing boards of trustees. Others are operated by state agencies. Such arrangements include reporting directly to the state commissioner or superintendent of education and not the state board of education or reporting to the administrator of a state agency responsible for human services, or the governing authority of the state responsible for higher education.

Table 1 lists the schools included in this study by regions of the country. Table 2 lists the schools by governance type.

Table 1
Residential Schools for the Deaf
by Region in the United States

Region	N	Percent
South	17	30.4
West	12	21.4
Northeast	15	26.8
North Central	12	21.4
Total	56	100.0

Table 2
Residential Schools for the Deaf in the United States
by Governance Type

Governance Type	N	Percent
State Board Education	25	44.6
Board of Trustees	20	35.7
Other	11	19.6
Total	56	100.0

The methods used to appoint members of the board of trustees responsible for 20 of the schools included in this study are listed in Table 3.

Table 3
Methods of Selecting Governing Board of Trustees in Residential Schools for the Deaf

Method of Selection	N	Percent
Appointed by Governor	12	60.0
Appointed by Board of Trustees	7	35.0
Other	1	5.0
Total	20	100.0

For schools under the authority of the state department of education, 58.3 percent of the schools report to a division other than one responsible for special education or instruction. This information is reported in Table 4.

Table 4
Division of State Education Departments Responsible for Residential Schools for the Deaf

Division	N	Percent
Special Education	6	25.0
State Schools	3	12.5
Instruction	1	4.2
Others	14	58.3
Total	24	100.0

The governing authority responsible for 50 of the residential schools (89.3 percent) had not changed during the past three years.

Seventy-three percent of the residential schools serve deaf children from the entire state. Fourteen schools (25 percent) serve deaf children from specified geographic areas within their respective states.

The respondents were asked to list the title of the official of the governing authority to whom the superintendent of the residential school reported. The response to this item yielded a divergent response category. Three basic categories emerged and are reported in Table 5.

Half of the superintendents report to their own board of trustees and the remainder report to the management structure organized by the state department of education. In addition to these categories, 13 of the schools (23.2 percent) have other organizational structures which include reporting to directors of institutions, coordinators of state facilities and executives of human services agencies or compensatory education programs.

Table 5
Managerial Superiors of Superintendents
of Residential Schools for the Deaf

The Superintendent Reports to:	n	Percent
Board of Trustees	16	28.5
State Board of Education	3	5.4
State Superinendent of Schools	7	12.5
Associate/Assistant State Superintendent	8	14.3
Director of State Schools for the Deaf	4	7.1
Board of Visitors	3	5.4
State Board of Regents	2	3.6
Others	13	23.2
Total	56	100.0

Admission Policy

A summary of responses to questions five through 12 included in the questionnaire on the admission policies used in the state operated residential schools for the deaf is shown in Table 6.

Fifty-one (91 percent) of the residential schools have written admission policies. The legal basis for these written policies on admission are either mandated by state law (30 percent) or local policy of the residential school (30 percent).

The admission policies were required by the state board of education for 11 of the schools. The board of trustees of eight schools required an admission policy.

The personnel of the residential schools had major input in the development of the admission policies in 80 percent of the schools. The next highest group exercising influence with input in the development of admission policies was state department of education personnel. The third highest group was the board of trustees. The group having little input in the development of admission policies was local school district personnel.

Parents were involved in the development of policies in 11 schools in the study. It is interesting to note that nine schools (16 percent) included input in the development of their admission policies from members of the state legislature.

In response to the questions on the source of the final approval of the admission policy used, 53 percent of the schools reported that the policy was approved by the school's superintendent. The data

Table 6

Summary of Responses to Questions 5 - 14 on

Admission Policy

Question	n	Percent
5. Does the school have a formal (written) admission policy? (N=56)		
YES	51	91.1
NO	5	8.9
If Yes, Please check the legal basis for the admissions policy (N=51)		
Mandated by State Law	17	30.4
Local Policy of Residential School	17	30.4
Permissive State Law	6	10.7
Required by State Board of Education	11	19.6
Required by Governing Board of Trustees	8	14.3
Other	6	10.7
6. The School's admission policy was developed with input from the following groups: (Check all that apply) (N=55)		
Residential School Personnel	45	80.4
State Department of Education Personnel	36	64.3
Public School Personnel	6	10.7
Parents	11	19.6
Board of Trustees	21	37.5
Legislature	9	16.1
Others	13	23.2
7. The Admissions Policy was Approved by: (N=55)		
Governing Board of Trustees	21	37.5
State Board of Education	19	33.9
State Department of Education	22	39.3
Residential School's Superintendent	30	53.6
Others	16	28.6
8. The current admissions policy was FIRST implemented during the _____ school year. (N=47)		
1954	1	1.8
1957	1	1.8
1969	3	3.6
1970	2	3.6
1971	1	1.8
1972	1	1.8
1974	1	1.8
1975	4	7.1
1977	1	1.8
1978	6	10.7
1979	7	12.5
1980	5	8.9
1981	11	19.6
1982	4	7.1
9. The Admissions Policy has been disseminated to: (N=54)		
Local School Districts	34	60.7
Special Education Directors in the State	40	71.4
Parents of Hearing Impaired Children	25	44.6
All Who Apply for Admission to the School	40	71.4
Advocacy Groups for Exceptional Children	20	35.7
10. Can the Residential School accept students for admission without the approval of the local school district in which the student is a legal resident? (N=56)		
YES	26	46.4
NO	30	53.6
11. The Residential School can accept students for admission if referred by: (N=56)		
Local School District	54	96.4
Parents	38	67.9
Human Service Agencies	30	53.6
The Courts	30	53.6
Others	11	19.6
12. During the past three (3) years the majority of students admitted to the residential school were referred by: (N=56)		
Local School Districts	29	51.8
Parents	24	42.9
Human Service Agencies	1	1.8
Others	2	3.6

suggest that governing boards of trustees, state boards of education, and state departments of education played a major role in the approval of the admission policies used in the residential schools.

Of the 47 schools responding to the question on the year the admission policy was first implemented, 11 (20 percent) of the schools reported that the policy was first implemented in 1981. The majority of the admission policies were first implemented between 1975 and 1982.

The admission policies of the residential schools were evenly disseminated among special education directors, local school districts, applicants for admission, parents, and advocacy groups for exceptional children.

In response to question ten as to whether or not the residential school could accept students without the approval of the local school district in which the student is a legal resident, 54 percent or 30 schools indicated that they could accept students without the approval of the local school district.

Local school districts and parents are the major referrers of students to state operated residential schools for the deaf. During the past three years, more than 50 percent of the schools in this study reported that the majority of students admitted to the residential schools were referred by local school districts. Forty-two percent of the schools reported that the majority of the students admitted during the past three years were based on parental referrals.

Admission Procedures

A summary of responses to questions 13 through 18 addressing the procedures used to admit students to the state operated residential schools for the deaf is presented in Table 7.

The residential schools accept and serve students from birth through age 26. Twenty of the schools (36 percent) have parent/infant programs and pre-school programs. Sixty-seven percent of the schools accept students through age 21. Three schools reported accepting students through ages 22, 23 and 26 respectively.

The legal basis for the age levels served by the majority of the schools (38) is mandated in state law. Twenty-one of the schools reported that the age levels admitted were also established in policy by the governing authority for the school.

Voluminous data are collected and used in assessing a student's eligibility for admission. Audiological information is the major assessment criteria used along with psychological tests, achievement tests and medical records.

The respondents were asked to list the three major criteria for admission to the residential school. Several major threads of commonality ran through most of the responses.

Fifty-one of the respondees listed either specific criteria or made a general statement regarding major criteria used in the admission of students.

Severe to profound hearing loss descriptions were used by the residential schools in describing the acceptable hearing loss for

Table 7

Summary of Responses to Questions 13 - 18

On Admission Procedures

Question	n	Percent
13. The school accepts for admission students from age _____through age _____. (N=56)		
Age Levels Served		
0 - 15	1	1.8
0 - 20	4	7.1
0 - 21	13	23.2
0 - 22	1	1.8
0 - 26	1	1.8
2 - 20	1	1.8
2 - 21	4	7.1
2½ - 21	1	1.8
3 - 16	1	1.8
3 - 20	2	3.6
3 - 21	5	8.9
3½ - 21	1	1.8
4 - 17	1	1.8
4 - 18	1	1.8
4 - 21	8	14.3
4½ - 20	1	1.8
4½ - 21	1	1.8
5 - 20	1	1.8
5 - 21	5	8.9
5 - 23	1	1.8
5½ - 21	1	1.8
14 - 19	1	1.8
14. The legal basis for the age levels served is: (N=56)		
Mandated by State Law	34	60.7
Permissive Legislative Statutes	13	23.2
Established in State Plan for Special Education	14	25.0
Established in Policy of the Governing Authority for the School	21	37.5
Established by Administration of the School	15	26.8
Others	3	5.4
15. The Types of Assessment Data used for assessing a student's eligibility for admission to this school include: (Check all that apply) (N=56)		
Psychological Tests	54	96.4
Achievement Test	51	91.1
Adaptive Behavior Rating Scales	39	69.6
Audiological Information	56	100.0
Parent Reports	47	83.9
Teacher Reports	48	85.7
Cumulative Records	49	87.5
Medical Records	52	92.9
Other	15	26.8
16. List the three (3) major criteria for admission to the residential school. (N=56)		
Hearing loss criteria	51	91.1
State or area residency	14	25.0
Mental functioning level	12	21.4
17. The Requirements for Written Parent/Guardian Consent for Students Admitted to this School Include: (Check all that apply) (N=56)		
For Referral	38	67.9
Evaluation of Student	47	83.9
Placement	49	87.5
18. After a student is admitted to the Residential School, how often is the school district in which the student is a legal resident involved in and/or notified of changes in the student's program? (N=56)		
Always	39	69.6
Usually	9	16.1
Seldom	7	12.5
Never	1	1.8

consideration for admission to the schools included in this study. These descriptions afford the schools flexibility in admission decisions. All of the schools reported that audiological data were required.

The majority of the respondees (32) used a general statement in describing the acceptable hearing loss required for admission to the school. These statements ranged from the basic educational definition of deafness listed in the Glossary used in this study to the equally flexible definition of hearing impairment as determined through manifestations of a hearing loss which adversely affects educational performance based on a comprehensive evaluation.

The second most common criteria for admission was a residency requirement for the state or a specific geographical area of the state. Although only 14 of the respondees included this criteria in their top three, it appears that all residential schools do have such criteria for admission. Another similar criteria concerned the age of prospective students. Seven schools included an age statement as one of three major criteria. The third category of admission criteria reported was mental functioning level. At least 12 schools required evidence of psychological testing to substantiate certain intelligence levels for admission. Several other groups of criteria were identified.

A summary of all criteria reported is listed below, including the number of residential schools responding in each category.

Criteria	N
Hearing loss	51
State-area residency	14
Mental functioning level	12
Age criteria	8
Ability to benefit from a residential program	6
Psychological functioning level	5
Local school district approval	5
Lack of program in school district	5
No additional handicapping conditions	4
Parent referral	3
Reading level	1

Written parental/guardian permission is required by all of the residential schools for referral, evaluation, and placement of students.

After a student is admitted to the residential school, the local school district in which the student is a legal resident is involved in or notified of any changes made in the student's program.

Denied Admission Procedures

A summary of responses to questions 19 through 21 on denied admission procedures is presented in Table 8.

The major criteria for denying admission to prospective students appeared to be more consistent among the residential schools than were those for admission. Again, the most widely used criteria concerned hearing level. Thirty-one schools listed insufficient hearing loss as

Table 8

Summary of Responses to Questions 19 - 23

on Denied Admission Procedures

Question	N	Percent
19. The three (3) three major criteria for denying admission to a student are: (N=56)		
Insufficiant hearing loss	31	55.4
Intellectually unable to benefit from program offered	16	29.0
Too many secondary handicapping conditions to succeed in the residential school	16	29.0
20.. The Final Decision to deny admission to a student is made by: (Check all that apply) (N=56)		
Superintendent of the School	29	51.8
An Admissions Review Committee	17	30.4
The School Principal	0	0
The School Psychologist	0	0
This school cannot deny admission to a student	3	5.4
Other	7	12.5
21. The authority to deny admission to a student is: (N=54)		
Established in Policy	38	70.4
Not Established in Policy	16	29.6
22. If a student is denied admission to the residential school, is there an appeal process? (N=56)		
YES	49	87.5
NO	4	7.1
NO RESPONSE	3	5.4
23. What actions are taken by the residential school when a student is denied admission? (Check all that apply) (N=56)		
Student is referred back to the local school district	48	85.7
Student is referred back to referring agency	32	57.1
Family is referred to an appropriate facility for the student's disability (ies)	37	66.1
The parents are notified in writing of denial	39	69.6
The school takes no action	2	3.6
Other	5	8.9

a major criterion for denying admission to a student. The second most commonly listed criterion for denying admission referred to the probability of prospective students not being able to "make it" in the residential school because of a physical or mental limitation. One school indicated that the lack of intellectual capacity to accomplish school goals would render a student ineligible for admission.

The third criterion listed was the extent of secondary multiply handicapping conditions. Similar criteria were used by 12 schools to deny admission. This criterion referred to the prospective student's inability to adjust to the residential setting due to psychological or behavioral problems. Five schools listed extensive emotional disturbance as criterion for denying admission. Again, this is similar to the three previously mentioned. A more general approach was taken by eight schools that used "unable to benefit from instruction" as a criterion.

Both age and lack of state residency were listed as criteria for denying admission by seven schools. Nine residential schools do not admit students if the student is able to benefit from a program in the local school district.

A summary of the criteria reported for denying admission is listed below, including the number of residential schools responding in each category.

Criteria for Denying Admission	N
Insufficient hearing loss	31
Intellectually unable to benefit from program offered	16
Too many secondary handicapping conditions to succeed in the residential school	16
State and area residency	10
Program available in local school district	9
Unable to benefit from instruction	8
Primary handicap not deafness	7
Lack of program, funding, staff	5
Others: Age, emotional disturbance	8

The final decision to deny admission to a student is made by the school's superintendent in 29 of the schools (51 percent). Some schools reported having an admissions review committee which makes the final decision for admission denial. Three schools included in the study cannot deny admission to a student. In 38 (68 percent) of the schools, the authority to deny admission to a student is established in policy.

Eight-seven percent of the residential schools have a written appeals process for denied admission. When a student is denied admission, the student is referred back to the local school district or referring agency and the parents are notified in writing. In some instances, the family is referred to a more appropriate facility.

Individualized Education Plan

A summary of responses to questions 24 through 27 on the individualized education plan (IEP) is presented in Table 9.

Table 9
Summary of Responses to Questions 24 - 27
on Individualized Education Plans

	Question	N	Percent
24.	The individualized education plan (IEP) for students admitted to this school is developed by: (N=56)		
	Local School District	2	3.6
	The Residential School	22	39.3
	The Local School District and the Residential School	32	57.1
25.	The responsibility for developing the IEP is: (Check only one) (N=55)		
	Specified in the State's plan for Special Education	38	67.9
	Specified in an inter-agency memorandum of agreement	1	1.8
	Specified in policy by the state board of education	6	10.7
	Specified in policy by the governing board of trustees	2	3.6
	Not established in a policy or regulatory statement	8	14.3
26.	Are parents involved in the development of the IEPs for students admitted to this school? (N=56)		
	YES	56	100.0
	NO	0	0
27.	The IEP for a student admitted to this school is developed: (N=56)		
	Prior to placement	26	46.4
	After placement	19	33.9
	Other	11	19.6

There is a cooperative effort between local school districts and residential schools for the deaf in developing the IEP for students admitted to residential schools. Fifty percent of the residential schools in this study develop the IEP jointly with the local school district. Thirty-nine percent or 22 residential schools develop the IEP for all students admitted.

The responsibility for developing the IEP is specified in the state's plan for special education in sixty-eight percent (38) of the responding schools.

Forty-six percent of the residential schools (26) reported that the IEP is developed prior to placement as required by Public Law 94-142. However, more than fifty percent of the responding schools reported that the IEP for students is developed after placement or some other procedure is used for determining placement.

All of the schools included in the study reported that parents are involved in developing the IEP for students admitted to the school.

Placement

Questions 28 through 34 included in the questionnaire used in this study on student placement are listed with responses in Table 10.

Seventy-five percent or 42 of the schools do not utilize a diagnostic classroom for determining academic and/or social variables for students admitted for the first time. However, 77 percent (43) of the responding residential schools do utilize a trial placement plan for

Table 10
Summary of Responses to Questions 28 - 34
on Placement

QUESTION	N	Percent
28. Does the residential school utilize a diagnostic classroom for students admitted for the first time to this school? (N=56)		
Yes	14	25.0
No	42	75.0
29. Does the residential school utilize a trial placement plan for determining final placement? (N=56)		
Yes	43	76.8
No	13	23.2
29a. If Yes, please circle the number of months a student is usually placed in trial placement status. (N=40)		
1	18	45.6
2	10	25.0
3	6	15.0
4	2	5.0
5	0	0
6	2	5.0
8	1	2.5
9 or more	1	2.5
30. Placement for students admitted to this school is determined: (N=56)		
At a separate placement meeting	32	57.1
During the IEP development or review meeting	22	39.3
Other	7	12.5
31. The criteria used for membership on the placement committee includes: (Check all that apply) (N=56)		
Knowledge of the child	45	80.4
Knowledge of program options available	47	83.9
Knowledge of deafness	43	76.8
Ability to understand evaluation results	41	73.2
There is no established criteria	13	23.2
32. Please check the placement team participants when the school determines placement. (Check all that apply) (N=56)		
Superintendent	15	26.8
Principal	47	83.9
Academic Supervisor	36	64.3
Teacher of the deaf	40	71.4
Regular classroom teacher	17	30.4
Diagnostician/school psycologist/ audiologist	54	96.4
Social worker	22	39.3
Parent	43	76.8
Representative of local school system	34	60.7
Student	34	60.7
Others	14	25.0
33. In placement committee meetings: (Check all that apply) (N=56)		
The residential school has voting privileges	20	35.7
Parents have voting privileges	13	23.2
The local school district has voting privileges		
A vote on placement is not taken; the IEP determines placement	36	64.3
34. In placement committee meetings the attendance of parents is: (N=56)		
Required	26	46.4
Not required	7	12.5
Optional	23	41.1
Parents not permitted in placement	0	0

for determining final placement. The residential schools utilizing trial placement usually retain students in this status from one to two months.

When placement decisions are made, the data reported in this study reveal that they are made by professionals knowledgeable about the area of deafness, the needs of students under consideration, available program options, and evaluation results.

In keeping with the provisions of Public Law 94-142, thirty-six of the residential schools do not vote on the placement of students. Placement is determined by the individualized education plan.

The attendance of parents is required in placement committee meetings in 26 or 46 percent of the residential schools. Twenty-three or 41 percent of the schools reported that the attendance of parents at placement committee meetings was optional.

Ninety - six percent of the residential schools reported that diagnosticians are placement team participants. Sixty percent (34) of the schools reported that when appropriate, the student is involved as a team participant when the residential school determines placement.

A Review of Admission Policy Documents

Fifty-one residential schools were reported in this study as having written admission policy statements. Copies of admission policies were received from 40 residential schools (71 percent).

Based on a review of selected literature on policy development and an analysis of selected provisions of Public Law 94-142, the author identified and employed five components for evaluating the admission policy documents.

The written admission policies submitted were reviewed in terms of how each addressed (1) eligibility criteria for admission, (2) procedures for admission including the point at which a referral became official, (3) written consent requirements, (4) placement procedures and (5) due process procedures.

As expected, an analysis of the written admission policy documents revealed a wide variety of information on policies governing admission and procedures used for placing students in the residential schools for the deaf.

The majority of the admission policy documents appear to have been developed for the purpose of fulfilling the spirit of the mandates of Public Law 94-142 and lacked substance in content pertaining to admission criteria and related procedural matters.

Six residential schools submitted exemplary admission policy documents. These documents were clearly written, organized in content, detailed and explicit in specifying eligibility criteria, admission procedures, placement procedures and due process procedures. One state recently published a detailed administrative manual on the placement of students in state operated and state funded residential schools which included answers to frequently asked questions on admission eligibility criteria.

This review of the admission policy documents submitted by the residential schools revealed that the majority of the documents submitted were not policies specifically governing admission but statements of procedures used for admission. Selected statements lifted directly from the implementing regulations of Public Law 94-142 or state statutes regarding the role and scope of services of the residential schools were contained in the majority of these documents. The statements from Public Law 94-142 were primarily related to due process, the IEP and confidentiality of information.

Very few of the policies included concise information on eligibility criteria for admission to the school. Those policy documents containing eligibility criteria included information on the types of disabilities admitted and served by the school, age categories, state or area residency requirements and from what agencies or persons official referrals were received.

Some residential schools listed the acceptable degree of hearing loss for a prospective student. At least five policy statements included statements indicating that the residential school would accept students if a determination was made that a program was not appropriate or available in the school district in which the student was a legal resident.

When the IEP or least restrictive environment (LRE) was addressed, it was frequently discussed in the memorandum of agreements between an agency of state government serving the disabled and the residential

schools and/or the state department of education. The memorandum of agreements reviewed in general were vague and reflective of philosophy and admission statements regarding the residential school and the role and scope of its service delivery system.

Several residential schools included in their admission policy, statements regarding the admission of students based on the availability of space, and the availability of an appropriate program to meet the students' needs.

Although the literature has clearly reported that the number of multiply handicapped students admitted to residential schools has increased within recent years (Schildroth, 1980), very few of the admission policies listed specific criteria or admission procedures used for this population.

Very few of the 40 admission policy statements included information on parental involvement and student involvement, when appropriate, in the admission process.

The range of information varied greatly among residential schools in the area of procedures used to determine placement and steps in the placement process. The greatest consistency found in the admission policies references placement decisions specifically addressed by Public Law 94-142 which mandates that a complete evaluation of the child's educational needs be conducted before any action is taken with respect to placement. Nearly all of the written policies specified notifying parents of decisions regarding admission and due process

procedures used in appealing a decision made by the school for the placement committee.

In many cases, the admission policy documents supported the responses provided by administrators of the residential schools on the survey instrument regarding age, residency requirements, parental consent, due process procedures and some aspects of eligibility requirements for admission to the schools. Although the survey instrument results revealed that the superintendent of the residential school had the final authority to deny admission to a prospective student, none of the admission policies stated the role of the superintendent of the residential school in the admission process.

Conclusions

An analysis of the data pertaining to the seven questions provide the basis for the following conclusions.

1. The data reported in this study revealed that student referrals to state operated residential schools for the deaf are based primarily on the severity of the degree of hearing loss. Public Law 94-142 states that placement is to be based on the student's individualized education plan. Forty-six percent of the schools included in this study reported that the individualized education plan is developed prior to placement. This would support the fact that referrals for admission are based on the individualized education plan for 26 of the schools included in this study, or that the student's need for

residential placement stems from the development and/or the content of the individualized education plan. However, 53 percent of the schools reported that the individualized education plan is developed either after placement or some other admission process is utilized.

An analysis of the responses to the questionnaire item regarding the major criteria for admission to the residential school revealed that the degree of hearing loss was a primary criteria for admission, along with the capability of the school to provide an appropriate program within certain staffing and programming limitations.

2. Local school districts are the major source of referrals for students admitted and placed in state operated residential schools for the deaf.

3. Residential schools across the country are operating, relatively, on the same admission policies and procedures. That is, there are no appreciable differences regionally.

4. There are no appreciable differences in the admission policies and practices of residential schools for the deaf by type of governance.

5. Local school districts play a major role in the referral and admission process of deaf students to residential schools included in this study. Fifty-three percent of the schools do not accept students for admission unless the referral is from the local school district.

6. The data reported in this study revealed that parents are included as required by Public Law 94-142, in placement, individualized

education plan development, and related decisions for students admitted to residential schools.

7. State operated residential schools for the deaf retain a high degree of autonomy in decisions to admit or deny admission to a prospective student. The authority to deny admission is established in policy by 70 percent of the residential schools included in this study.

Recommendations for the Field of the Education of the Deaf

It is clear from an analysis of the admission policy documents and the criteria reported by the residential schools included in this study that the severity of the hearing loss and the capability of the schools to serve prospective students determines who will be admitted. Hence, the educational programs and staffing levels of the residential schools determine who is admitted rather than the actual or perceived needs of the prospective student.

Identification of Disabilities Served

Students who are severely or profoundly multiply handicapped with low mental functioning levels are excluded from admission to the majority of the state operated residential schools included in this study. Twelve schools included in this study reported that a specified intelligence test score was required for students applying for admission.

Residential schools for the deaf have been in a state of transition since the full implementation of Public Law 94-142. During this period of transition, students with deafness as a primary handicapping condition and other mild or moderately concomitant disabilities have been accepted for admission to some extent. The admission of these students appears to have been primarily based on a need to keep enrollments at a given level and for other political-economic reasons.

The literature has supported the fact that institutions and special schools are receiving more referrals for services for students with multiply handicapping conditions. However, in reality, the data show that only a limited number of these students are accepted for admission in state operated residential schools for the deaf.

There is a need for residential schools for the deaf to clearly identify the type disabilities, in addition to deafness, that can be served within the limitations of certain staffing and programming capabilities of the schools. Residential school administrators should provide the leadership in conducting a statewide needs assessment in concert with other agencies using hard demographic data to support service areas that are needed or in need of expansion within the school, including clearly developed criteria for staffing, programming, and implementation.

This leadership should include, but not be limited to understanding the implications of the criteria for programming and staffing, and developing budgets and appropriate justification for presentation to

policy makers at the state level who can impact on funding. Additionally, this would ensure a service delivery system for all students and the exclusion of only a limited number.

Denied Admission

The autonomy enjoyed by residential schools for the deaf in exercising exclusive domain in denying admission to prospective students, sanctioned in state laws and/or policies for seventy percent of the schools, is unwarranted in an era of declining fiscal resources at the state and local levels. This practice may be questionable also in view of the mandate given to states by Public Law 94-142 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. When the fact is considered that in excess of $170 million was reported as the total operating budget for residential schools for the deaf in the United States during the 1979-1980 school year, it is difficult to justify the exclusion of students who cannot be served in local school districts.

Based on the information reported by residential schools included in this study, there is a need for a critical review of the legality of the denial of admission and the acceptance of students in isolation of any contact with the school district in which the student is a legal resident.

IEP and Placement

There appears to be a dilemma in two areas relating to Public Law 94-142 and the admission of students to residential schools for the deaf:

the development of the individualized education plan, and placement procedures.

More than fifty percent of the residential schools reported that the individualized education plan is developed after placement or some other procedure is employed. Questionnaire respondents reported that the state plan for special education specified who is responsible for developing the individualized education plan. In many cases, this responsibility is a shared one between the residential school and the local school district.

The question of when the individualized education plan is developed is critical in view of the fact that Public Law 94-142 specifies that it is to be developed prior to placement. This is also important in that the assessment process used for prospective students is an integral part of the development of the individualized education plan.

The literature has revealed that the majority of evaluators of deaf and hearing impaired students employed in local school districts are inadequately prepared to test and assess these students. States should consider assigning to the residential school for the deaf the responsibility for the evaluation of all prospective students and the development of the student's individualized education plan. This would further expand the role and scope of the services of the residential school as a resource center for the state. Furthermore, it would ensure that all student referred are assessed by qualified evaluators, hence the conflict between the individualized education plan and the placement process may be lessened.

Components of a Model Admission Policy

The significance of this investigation on the admission policies and practices of state operated residential schools for the deaf in the United States rests in the application of its findings in the development and refinement of admission policies and practices utilized by the schools. The following observations are reported in this context based on the findings reported in the study.

Admission policies, practices and/or procedures utilized by an organization should be developed and implemented in the context of applicable federal and state laws and regulations. Policies should be flexible and encompass a wide range of present and anticipated circumstances.

Based on the information reported in this study and a critical review of the admission policy documents submitted by the residential schools included in the survey, the author has identified the following components that should be included, as a minimum, in the development of policies governing the admission of students to residential schools.

1. A position statement regarding the role and scope of services provided by the residential school including citations from applicable state laws, regulations, or mandates established in policy by the governing authority of the school, should serve as a preface to policy statements.

2. The policy should be clearly titled, with a date indicating when and by whom approved.

3. The admission policy should state clear and concise eligibility requirements for admission which would include, but not be limited to, the following:

   (a) criteria for admission for students who are deaf, including the degree of hearing loss, with no additional mental or physical impairments;

   (b) criteria for admission for students who are deaf with additional mental and physical impairments (including the range of the severity served by the school);

   (c) age levels served by the school;

   (d) state or area residency requirements, if applicable;

   (e) the identification of the role and/or responsibilities of the local school district in which the student is a legal resident in the admission process;

   (f) the official source or sources from whom referrals are accepted and acted upon for admission.

4. The admission policy should include a detailed listing of procedures used by the residential school in processing a student for admission, including the point at which the referral becomes official. The identification of the local school district's role in this process should be included in this section.

   The section on admission procedures should follow the section on eligibility criteria for admission. A clear distinction should be made between each of these categories or sections or the policy.

   (a) The admission procedures section should include the identification of the agency

or agencies responsible for the development of the individualized education plan, the composition of the staffing committee, and the time frames in which certain procedures must be completed.

This section may be expanded to include a statement regarding who has jurisdictional domain (the local school district or the residential school for the deaf) in specific areas included in the admission procedures.

(b) The identification of the role and responsibility in the admission process of the following groups should be clearly delineated and described:

- Parents of prospective students, guardians, surrogate parents
- Local school districts
- State education agency or other appropriate agencies

(c) The identification of procedures followed when a student is denied admission, including:

- Conditions on which denials are made
- The identification of due process procedures to be followed when admission is denied

5. Written consent requirements.

6. Due process procedures.

7. The name, title, address, telephone number of the staff member (or office) in the residential school to whom inquiries should be made regarding the admission policies and practices of the residential school should be included in the policy document.

It is recommended that admission policies be written in clear, concise language with particular attention given to the avoidance of the over usage of legal terminology, educational terms or jargon that would be difficult for laymen to understand. The use of abbreviations should be avoided or if used, kept to a minimum. Citations from federal regulations and/or guidelines should be used with caution and, if possible, explained for ease in reading and interpretation.

Residential school administrators should avoid developing admission policies without the participation of those constituents directly affected by the policy (i.e., local school districts, teachers). It should be remembered that policy development is comprehensive and participatory. The residential school should also provide the technical assistance and resources necessary to support its admission policy implementation.

Teachers and other professional staff members in the residential school should be knowledgeable about the school's admission policy. The dissemination of the admission policy to local school districts is imperative. Efforts to educate personnel in local school districts regarding the basis for inclusion of particular provisions in the admission policy may help to reduce any tension that may exist between local school districts, state department of education personnel and the residential school.

The written policy document should be organized in a format that aids understanding and allows for easy reading. For example, dividing

the policy into major divisions and subdivisions and using descriptive labels for each may be helpful. It is also advisable to enumerate items in a series of steps in the process and sequence these in the most logical order. The use of columned diagrammatic representation can promote understanding of the relationship of provisions within the policy.

It would be helpful to residential school administrators in forecasting if a detailed master list were maintained of all admissions and denials for admission to the residential school. Such a list should include but not be limited to the name of the student, date of referral, action taken (admitted or denied) and if denied, the type services or programs required that could not be provided by the residential school. The source of the referral and other notations that would be helpful for future reference should also be considered for inclusion in such a list.

Each admission policy should be specifically designed for the residential school that will be affected by its provisions. There are some commonalities that are peculiar to all admission policies affecting deaf students; however, policies and practices that may be effective in one state or region of the country may not be effective if employed in another state or region.

Recommendations for Future Research

This investigation was undertaken to provide a state-of-the-art study on the admission policies and practices of state operated residential schools for the deaf. Several suggestions resulted from this study and should be addressed in future research.

The study of admission policies and practices is a complex undertaking, and additional research is needed in several areas. The following recommendations are suggested.

1. The design used in this study utilized the superintendents of state operated residential schools for the deaf. Since it was not possible to validate the responses to the survey instrument, different respondents might perceive the admission policies and practices utilized by residential schools differently. Some form of audit appears advisable.

   Recommendation: Replication of this study using directors of special education in local school districts as the respondents for the survey should be considered.

2. An analysis of the written admission policies and procedures and memoranda of agreement revealed that numerous coordination efforts, both formal and informal, between local school districts, state departments of education, and residential schools for the deaf are in effect in many states. A study addressing the coordination efforts between these three educational service providers is needed in view of the declining enrollments in residential schools and the continued thrust

for the integration of handicapped children in programs offered in local school districts.

> Recommendation: Research should be conducted to identify the various coordination efforts in effect in the states that are designed to bring about improved and expanded educational opportunities for deaf students.

3. This study confirmed earlier reports in the literature that there is no national system of governance of residential schools for the deaf. This study also revealed that there are no appreciable differences in the policies and practices used by residential schools under different governance structures. Thirty-one of the residential schools in this study are under a governing authority other than the state agency responsible for elementary and secondary education.

> Recommendation: An ethnographic study should be undertaken to investigate the effectiveness and efficiency of the governance structures of state operated residential schools on selected organizational and programmatic variables.

4. The literature revealed that more multiply handicapped deaf students are now enrolled or being referred to residential schools for the deaf. It was beyond the scope of this study to investigate the process of admission for this population or the identification of the type of multiply handicapping conditions served by the residential schools.

Recommendation: A study should be conducted to determine the criteria used for the admission of students who are multiply handicapped.

Alschusler, Joan N. Education for the handicapped. Journal of Law and Education, 1978, 7, 523-538.

Anderson, R., Stevens, G., & Stuckless, R. Provisions for the education of mentally retarded deaf children in residential schools for the deaf. Pittsburgh University Press, Pennsylvania, School of Education. Report No. BR-5-0977, Grant OEG-32-48 110-5008, July 1966.

Anderson, Robert & Stevens, Godfrey. Policies and procedures for admission of mentally retarded deaf children to residential schools for the deaf. American Annals of the Deaf, 1970, 115, 30-36.

American Association of School Administrators and The National School Boards Association. Written policies for school boards. Arlington, Va.: 1955.

American School Board Journal. Why put policies in writing? 57, October 1969.

Baldridge, J. V. A political theory of organizational policy. Mimeographed. Stanford University Press, 1970.

Bender, Ruth E. The conquest of deafness. Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press, 1970.

Blaschke, Charles L. Case study of the implementation of Public Law 94-142. Washington, D.D.: U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of the Handicapped. Education Turnkey Systems, May 1979.

Bloom, B. S., Hastings, J. T., and Madaus, G. F. Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of study learning. New York: McGray-Hill, 1971.

Brill, Richard G. The education of the deaf: administrative professional development. Washington, D. C.: Gallaudet College Press, 1974.

_____, Merrill, E., Frisina, D. R. Recommended organizational policies in the education of the deaf. Washington, D. C.: Executives of American Schools for the Deaf, 1973.

Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U. S. 483, 1954.

Bureau of the Census. Statistical abstracts of the United States: 1980. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Commerce, 1980, 101.

Campbell, R. F., & Mazzoni, T. L. State policy making for the public schools. Berkley: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1976.

Campbell, R. F. & Stroufe, G. E. (Eds.) Strengthening state departments of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Campbell, R. F. & Mazzoni, T. L. The organization and control of American schools. Columbus, Ohio: C. E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1970.

Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf. Report of the ad hoc committee to define deaf and hard of hearing. American Annals of the Deaf, October 1975, 509-512.

Conference of Executives of Amdministrators Serving the Deaf. Response to department of education invitation for public comments EHA: implementation of part B of the education of the handicapped children act. Washington, D. D.: unpublished Position Paper, February 1981.

Cordasco, Francesco. A brief history of education. Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams, and Company, 1965.

Cronbach, L. J. Essentials of psychological testing. (3rd Ed.) New York: Harper and Rowe, 1970.

Davis, H. & Silverman, S. R. Hearing and deafness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Denton, David. Statewide planning in the education of the hearing impaired. American Annals of the Deaf, 1978, 123, 35-45.

DeWalt vs. Burkholder. In Blair, N. (Ed.) Education for the Handicapped Law Report. Washington, D. D.: CRR Publishing Company, March 1980.

Doctor, P. V. Multiple handicaps in the field of deafness. Exceptional Children, 1959, 26, 156-158.

Education Daily. Deaf children placed in inappropriate classes, expert says. Washington, D. C.: Capitol Publishing Company, February 7, 1981.

Education For All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, Public Law 94-142. 20 U. S. C. A.

Education Handicapped Law Report. Suit concerning profoundly deaf child raises difficult question. Washington, D. C.: 32, September 1980.

Federal Register, 1977, 42, 86. (Nondiscrimination on Basis of Handicap - Regulations).

Federal Register, 1977, 42, 163. (Education of Handicapped Children - Regulations).

Fauth, B. & Fauth, W. A study of the proceedings of the convention of American instructors of the deaf 1850-1949. Washington, D. C.: Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, 1967, 1.

Fay, E. A. Histories of American schools for the deaf, 1817-1893. The Volta Review, 1893, 1.

Fuller, Carl W. Your child, maturity and you: a talk with parents. American Annals of the Deaf, 1962, 107.

Garrison, K. C. & Force, D. G. The psychology of exceptional children. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1950.

Gearheart, B. R. & Wright, W. S. Organization and administration of educational programs for exceptional children. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publishers, 1979.

Georgia Department of Education. State schools in transition: a study of state operated schools in Georgia. Atlanta, 1978.

Georgia School for the Deaf. Centennial Celebration Program. Georgia Department of Education, 1948.

Gilliam, J. & Coleman, M. Who influences IEP Committee decisions? Exceptional Children, 1981, 47:8, 642-644.

Griffith, Barry L. Reshaping the role of the state school for the deaf. Audiology and Hearing Education, 1977, 3:2, 20-25.

Griffith, Jerry. Persons with hearing loss. Springfield, Illinois: Charles Thompson Company, 1969.

Guba, E. G. Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation. Los Angeles: University of California Center for the Study of Evaluation. Monograph Series in Evaluation, 1978.

Harris, Sam. State departments of education, state boards of education, and chief state school officers. Washington, D. C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare/Office of Education. U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Hodgson, K. W. The deaf and their problems. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954.

Holland, Richard. An analysis of the decision making process in special education. Exceptional Children, 1980, 46, 551-554.

Hoy, Wayne & Miskel, Cecil. Educational administration: theory, research, and practice. New York: Random House, 1978.

Isenberg, Robert. Sparsely populated areas: guidelines for research. In C. Meisgeier & J. D. King (Eds.), The process of special education administration. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Book Company, 1970.

Joiner, Lee & Sabatino, David. A policy study of Public Law 94-142. Exceptional Children, 1981, 48:1, 24-32.

Karchmer, M. A. & Trybus, R. J. Who are the deaf children in mainstreamed programs? Washington, D. C.: Office of Demographic Studies, Gallaudet College, 1977.

Kenezevich, S. J. Administration of public education. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Kirk, S. A. Educating exceptional children. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972.

Large, Donald. Special problems of the deaf under the education for all handicapped children act of 1975. Washington University Law Quarterly, 1980, 58, 213-275.

Martin, Reed. The impact of current legal action on educating handicapped children. Champaign, Illinois: Research Press, 1980.

Meisgeier, C. H. & King, J. D. The process of special education administration. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Book Company, 1970.

Mills vs. Board of Education of the District of Columbis. 348 F. Supp. 866, 876 (D. D. C.) 1972.

Moores, Donald F. Educating the deaf: psychology, principles and practices. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education. An analysis of Public Law 94-142. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1976.

Parks, G. & Berman, P. Federal aid to rural schools: Current patterns and unmet needs. Santa Monica, California. The Rand Corporation. December, 1979.

Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 334 F. Supp. 1257 (ED. Pa. 1971).

Reller, T. Educational administration in metropolitan areas. Bloomington, Indiana : Phi Delta Kappa Monograph Series, 1974.

Reller, T. & Morphet E. (Eds.) Comparative educational administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Incorporated, 1962.

Salem, J. & Herward, P. A survey to determine the impact of P. L. 94-142 on residential schools for the deaf. American Annals of the Deaf, 1978, 123, 524-527.

Schildroth, Arthur. Public residential schools for the deaf students in the United States, 1970-1978. American Annals of the Deaf, 1980, 125, 80-91.

Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement. Occasional papers in educational policy analysis. Raleigh, North Carolina: The Council, 1981.

Springdale School District vs. Grace. In Blair, N. (Ed.) Education for the Handicapped Law Report. Washington, D. C.: CRR Publishing Company, March 1980.

Taylor, J. Educational Programs. In Lowenfeld, B. (Ed.) The Visually handicapped child in school. New York: John Day Company, 1973.

Thompson, J. Policymaking in American public education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

Thorndike, R. L. (Ed.) Eucational measurement (2nd Ed.) Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Thurman, Kenneth S. Children's response to deafness: some implications for mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 1979, 45.

United States Department of Education. Study for determining the least restrictive environment (LRE) placement of handicapped children. Washington, D. C.: Applied Management Sciences, 1980.

United States Department of Education. Second annual report to congress on the implementation of Public Law 94-142: the education for all handicapped children act. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Special Education, 1980.

United States Department of Education. Individualized education programs - policy paper. Washington, D. C.: United States Office of Special Education, May 23, 1980.

Walker, H. The individualized education program as a vehicle for delivery of special education and related services to handicapped children. In developing criteria for the evaluation of individualized education programs. Philadelphia, Pa.: Research for Better Schools, 1978.

Weatherley, Richard. Reforming special education: policy implementation from state level to street level. In M. I. T. studies in American politics and public policy, Martha Weinberg (Ed.), Boston: M. I. T. Press, 1979.

Weatherley, Richard & Lipsky, M. Street-level bureaucrats and instructional innovation: implementing special education reforms. Harvard Educational Review, 1977, 47, 171-197.

Weintraub, F. J. & Abeson, A. R. State law and education of handicapped children: issues and recommendations. Arlington, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1971.

White House Conference on Child Health and Protection. Special Education: the handicapped and the gifted. Report of the committee on special classes, Section III, education and training. Volume II-F. New York: Century, 1931, p. 277.

Wilkin, W. H. & Callahan, J. J. Disparities in special education services the need for better fiscal management. Washington, D. C.: National conference of State Legislators, 1976

Wooden, H. Z. Deaf and hard of hearing children. In L. M. Dunn (Ed.) Exceptional Children In The Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963, p. 324.

Zeigler, L. Harmon. Governing american schools. North Scituate, Massachusetts: Duxbury Press, 1974.

GLOSSARY OF SELECTED TERMS

ADMISSION POLICY - Statements and procedures approved by a school's administrative officials or governing authority that is used in accepting students for admission, or denying admission.

DEAF - A hearing impairment which precludes successful processing of linguistic information through audition with or without a hearing aid (CEASD, 1975).

HARD-OF-HEARING - Those in whom the sense of hearing, although defective, is functional with or without a hearing aid (CEASD, 1975).

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE - The legal body or authority exercising jurisdiction over the administration and/or management of a residential school.

LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT - The county or independent entity in a local municipality within a state legally empowered to establish and maintain public schools.

PUBLIC LAW 94-142 - The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EHA) enacted by Congress in 1975 mandating that all school-age handicapped children in the United States be provided "a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment," (Federal Register, 1977).

RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS FOR THE DEAF - An organizational pattern whereby a boarding facility is provided for some or all of the deaf children who either may attend a segregated school on campus or may receive some of their educational services through a cooperative arrangement with the public or private schools of the community in which the residential school is located. Usually, most of the students live at the school at least five days a week and attend classes on campus. Some pupils may live in the community and may be enrolled as day students at the residential school (Taylor, 1973).

MULTIPLY HANDICAPPED - Concomitant impairments (such as mentally retarded-blind, mentally retarded-orthopedically impaired, etc.), the combination of which causes such severe educational problems that they cannot be accommodated in special education programs solely for one of the impairments. The term does not include deaf-blind children, (Federal Register, 1977).

A Survey of Admission Policies and Practices of State Operated Residential Schools for the Deaf

Statement of Confidentiality

All information reported in this questionnaire will be treated as confidential. The study report will attribute no data specifically to any person or residential school. This statement also applies to information contained in the Admission Policy document requested from your school.

Please attach a copy of the admissions policy for your school to the completed questionnaire and return in the stamped, self-addressed envelope. Should you have any questions or desire additional information, please telephone or write

Peyton Williams Jr.
(404) 656-2591
Georgia Department of Education
Office of State Schools
231 State Office Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

SURVEY OF ADMISSION POLICIES AND PRACTICES
OF STATE OPERATED RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS
FOR THE DEAF

Q U E S T I O N N A I R E

(SCHOOL LABEL)

_____
Name of Person Completing Questionnaire

(Area Code) _____
Telephone Number

I. Governance

1. PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX INDICATING THE GOVERNING AUTHORITY RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL.

☐ STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (If Checked, Check also the appropriate Division Responsible for the School)

- ☐ DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
- ☐ DIVISION OF STATE SCHOOLS
- ☐ DIVISION OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
- ☐ DIVISION OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
- ☐ OTHER: (Please specify)_____

☐ GOVERNING BOARD OF TRUSTEES (If Checked, Check also how the Members are Appointed)

- ☐ BY THE GOVERNOR
- ☐ BY A STATE AGENCY
- ☐ BY THE GOVERNING BOARD OF TRUSTEES
- ☐ OTHER: (Please specify)_____

☐ OTHER: (Please specify) _____

_____

2. HAS THERE BEEN A CHANGE IN THE GOVERNING AUTHORITY OF THIS RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL DURING THE PAST THREE YEARS?

☐ YES ☐ NO

IF ANSWER IS YES, BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE CHANGE:_____

_____

_____

3. THE SUPERINTENDENT OR HEAD OF THE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL REPORTS TO:

_____
(Please list title of state or board of trustee official)

4. THE GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS OF THE STATE SERVED BY THIS SCHOOL INCLUDES:

☐ THE ENTIRE STATE

☐ A SPECIFIED GEOGRAPHICAL AREA OF THE STATE
(If checked, please specify radius in miles or boundaries)

_____

_____

II. Admission Policy

5. DOES THE SCHOOL HAVE A FORMAL (WRITTEN) ADMISSIONS POLICY?

☐ YES ☐ NO

IF YES, PLEASE CHECK THE LEGAL BASIS FOR THE ADMISSIONS POLICY

☐ MANDATED BY STATE LAW

☐ LOCAL POLICY OF THE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL

☐ PERMISSIVE STATE LAW

☐ REQUIRED BY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☐ REQUIRED BY GOVERNING BOARD OF TRUSTEES

☐ OTHER: (Please specify)_____

IF NO, BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE PROCESS OR SEQUENCE USED TO ADMIT A STUDENT:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(Please use an additional sheet for response if necessary)

6. THE SCHOOL'S ADMISSIONS POLICY WAS DEVELOPED WITH INPUT FROM THE FOLLOWING GROUPS: (Check all that apply)

- ☐ RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL PERSONNEL
- ☐ STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
- ☐ PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL
- ☐ OTHER (Please specify)

  _____

- ☐ PARENTS
- ☐ BOARD OF TRUSTEES
- ☐ LEGISLATURE

7. THE ADMISSIONS POLICY WAS APPROVED BY: (Check all that apply)

- ☐ GOVERNING BOARD OF TRUSTEES
- ☐ STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
- ☐ STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
- ☐ RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL'S SUPERINTENDENT
- ☐ OTHER: (Please specify)_____

8. THE CURRENT ADMISSIONS POLICY WAS <u>FIRST</u> IMPLEMENTED DURING THE _____ SCHOOL YEAR.

9. THE ADMISSIONS POLICY HAS BEEN DISSEMINATED TO: (Check all that apply)

- ☐ LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS
- ☐ SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS IN THE STATE
- ☐ PARENTS OF HEARING IMPAIRED CHILDREN
- ☐ ALL WHO APPLY FOR ADMISSION TO THE SCHOOL
- ☐ ADVOCACY GROUPS FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

10. CAN THIS SCHOOL ACCEPT STUDENTS FOR ADMISSION WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT IN WHICH THE STUDENT IS A LEGAL RESIDENT?

☐ YES ☐ NO

11. THIS SCHOOL CAN ACCEPT STUDENTS FOR ADMISSION IF REFERRED BY: (Check all that apply)

☐ LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

☐ PARENTS

☐ HUMAN SERVICES AGENCIES

☐ THE COURTS

☐ OTHERS: Please specify)_____

12. DURING THE PAST THREE (3) YEARS THE MAJORITY OF STUDENTS ADMITTED TO THIS RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL WERE REFERRED BY: (Please check ONLY one)

☐ LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

☐ PARENTS

☐ HUMAN SERVICES AGENCIES

☐ THE COURTS

☐ OTHER: (Please specify)_____

III. ADMISSION PROCEDURES

13. THE SCHOOL ACCEPTS FOR ADMISSION STUDENTS FROM AGE ____ THROUGH AGE ____.

14. THE LEGAL BASIS FOR THE AGE LEVELS SERVED ARE:

☐ MANDATED BY STATE LAW

☐ PERMISSIVE LEGISLATIVE STATUTES

☐ ESTABLISHED IN THE STATE'S PLAN FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

☐ ESTABLISHED IN POLICY BY THE GOVERNING AUTHORITY FOR THE SCHOOL

☐ ESTABLISHED BY THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCHOOL

☐ OTHERS: (Please specify)_____

15. THE TYPES OF ASSESSMENT DATA USED FOR ASSESSING A STUDENT'S ELIGIBILITY FOR ADMISSION TO THIS SCHOOL INCLUDE: (Check all that apply)

- ☐ PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS
- ☐ ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
- ☐ ADAPTIVE BEHAVIOR RATING SCALES
- ☐ AUDIOLOGICAL INFORMATION
- ☐ PARENT REPORTS
- ☐ TEACHER REPORTS
- ☐ CUMULATIVE RECORDS
- ☐ MEDICAL RECORDS
- ☐ OTHERS: (Please specify)_____

_____

16. THE THREE (3) MAJOR CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION TO THIS SCHOOL ARE: (i.e., specified degree of hearing loss, etc.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

17. THE REQUIREMENTS FOR WRITTEN PARENT/GUARDIAN CONSENT FOR STUDENTS ADMITTED TO THIS SCHOOL INCLUDE: (Check all that apply)

- ☐ FOR REFERRAL
- ☐ EVALUATION OF STUDENTS BY THE SCHOOL TO DETERMINE ELIGIBILITY
- ☐ PLACEMENT IN THE SCHOOL

18. AFTER A STUDENT IS ADMITTED TO THE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL, HOW OFTEN IS THE SCHOOL DISTRICT IN WHICH THE STUDENT IS A LEGAL RESIDENT INVOLVED IN AND/OR NOTIFIED OF CHANGES IN THE STUDENT'S PROGRAM?

☐ ALWAYS ☐ SELDOM

☐ USUALLY ☐ NEVER

IV. DENIED ADMISSION PROCEDURE

19. THE THREE (3) MAJOR CRITERIA FOR DENYING ADMISSION TO A STUDENT ARE: (Please use an additional sheet if necessary)

_____

_____

_____

_____

20. THE FINAL DECISION TO DENY ADMISSION TO A STUDENT IS MADE BY: (Check ONLY one)

☐ SUPERINTENDENT OF THE SCHOOL

☐ AN ADMISSIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE

☐ THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

☐ THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST

☐ THIS SCHOOL CANNOT DENY ADMISSION TO A STUDENT

☐ OTHER: (Please specify)_____

21. THE AUTHORITY TO DENY ADMISSION TO A STUDENT IS:

☐ ESTABLISHED IN POLICY

☐ NOT ESTABLISHED IN POLICY

COMMENTS:_____

_____

22. IF A STUDENT IS DENIED ADMISSION TO THE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL, IS THERE AN APPEAL PROCESS? ☐ YES ☐ NO

IF YES, PLEASE LIST THE STEPS IN THIS PROCESS.

_____

_____

_____

(Please use an additional sheet for response if necessary)

23. WHAT ACTIONS ARE TAKEN BY THE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL WHEN A STUDENT IS DENIED ADMISSION? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ STUDENT IS REFERRED BACK TO THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
- ☐ STUDENT IS REFERRED BACK TO THE REFERRING AGENCY
- ☐ FAMILY IS REFERRED TO AN APPROPRIATE FACILITY FOR THE STUDENT'S DISABILITY(IES)
- ☐ THE PARENTS ARE NOTIFIED IN WRITING
- ☐ THE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL TAKES NO ACTION
- ☐ OTHER: (Please specify) _____

_____

V. INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PLANS (IEP)

24. THE INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PLAN (IEP) FOR STUDENTS ADMITTED TO THIS SCHOOL IS DEVELOPED BY:

- ☐ THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
- ☐ THE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL
- ☐ THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT AND THE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

_____

25. THE RESPONSIBILITY OF DEVELOPING THE IEP IS: (Check ONLY one)

- ☐ SPECIFIED IN THE STATE'S PLAN FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION
- ☐ SPECIFIED IN AN INTER-AGENCY MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
- ☐ SPECIFIED IN POLICY BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
- ☐ SPECIFIED IN POLICY BY THE GOVERNING BOARD OF TRUSTEES
- ☐ NOT ESTABLISHED IN A POLICY OR REGULATORY STATEMENT

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

26. ARE PARENTS INVOLVED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE IEPs FOR STUDENTS ADMITTED TO THIS SCHOOL?

☐ YES ☐ NO

27. THE IEP FOR A STUDENT ADMITTED TO THIS SCHOOL IS DEVELOPED:

☐ PRIOR TO PLACEMENT

☐ AFTER PLACEMENT

VI. PLACEMENT

28. DOES THE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL UTILIZE A DIAGNOSTIC CLASSROOM FOR STUDENTS ADMITTED FOR THE FIRST TIME TO THIS SCHOOL?

☐ YES ☐ NO

29. DOES THE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL UTILIZE A TRIAL PLACEMENT PLAN FOR DETERMINING FINAL PLACEMENT?

☐ YES ☐ NO

IF YES, PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF MONTHS A STUDENT IS USUALLY PLACED IN TRIAL PLACEMENT STATUS.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 more than 9

30. PLACEMENT FOR STUDENTS ADMITTED TO THIS SCHOOL IS DETERMINED:

☐ AT A SEPARATE PLACEMENT MEETING

☐ DURING THE IEP DEVELOPMENT OR REVIEW MEETING

☐ OTHER: (Please specify)_____

31. THE CRITERIA USED FOR MEMBERSHIP ON THE PLACEMENT COMMITTEE INCLUDES: (Check all that apply)

☐ KNOWLEDGE OF THE CHILD

☐ KNOWLEDGE OF PROGRAM OPTIONS AVAILABLE

☐ KNOWLEDGE OF DEAFNESS

☐ ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND EVALUATION RESULTS

☐ THERE IS NO ESTABLISHED CRITERIA FOR MEMBERSHIP

32. PLEASE CHECK THE PLACEMENT TEAM PARTICIPANTS WHEN THE SCHOOL DETERMINES PLACEMENT: (Check all that apply)

- ☐ SUPERINTENDENT
- ☐ PRINCIPAL
- ☐ ACADEMIC SUPERVISOR
- ☐ TEACHER OF THE DEAF
- ☐ REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER
- ☐ DIAGNOSTICIANS/SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST/AUDIOLOGIST
- ☐ SOCIAL WORKER
- ☐ PARENT
- ☐ REPRESENTATIVE FROM LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
- ☐ THE STUDENT (IF DETERMINED APPROPRIATE)
- ☐ OTHER: (Please specify)_____

_____

33. IN PLACEMENT COMMITTEE MEETINGS: (Check all that apply)

- ☐ THE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL HAS VOTING PRIVILEGES
- ☐ THE PARENT(S) HAVE VOTING PRIVILEGE
- ☐ THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT HAS VOTING PRIVILEGES
- ☐ A VOTE ON PLACEMENT IS NOT TAKEN: THE IEP DETERMINES PLACEMENT

34. IN PLACEMENT COMMITTEE MEETINGS THE ATTENDANCE OF PARENTS IS:

- ☐ REQUIRED ☐ NOT REQUIRED ☐ OPTIONAL
- ☐ PARENT NOT PERMITTED IN PLACEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

PLEASE ATTACH A COPY OF THE ADMISSIONS POLICY FOR YOUR SCHOOL TO THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE AND RETURN IN THE STAMPED, SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE. SHOULD YOU HAVE QUESTIONS OR DESIRE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, PLEASE TELEPHONE OR WRITE:

PEYTON WILLIAMS, JR.
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF STATE SCHOOLS
231 STATE OFFICE BUILDING
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30334
(404) 656-2591